

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

<b>LABOR SAVING SYSTEMS LTD.</b>	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 4:21-cv-01389
v.	§	
	§	
<b>DOES 1–79,</b>	§	
Defendants.	§	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S  
MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

Pending before the Court is a Motion for Default Judgment Against Does 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 74 (the “Motion”) [doc. 56] filed by Labor Saving Systems LTD. Having carefully considered the motion, the Court **FINDS** and **CONCLUDES** that it should be **GRANTED** for the reasons stated therein. Consequently, the Court **RECOMMENDS** that Plaintiff’s motion [doc. 56] be **GRANTED** as to Does 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 74 only, and that the District Court Judge enter the proposed Order that was submitted to the Court by Plaintiff and attached herein as Exhibit A.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO PROPOSED  
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), each party to an action has the right to serve and file specific written objections in the United States District Court to the United States Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation (“FCR”) within fourteen (14) days after the party has been served with a copy of such FCR. The United States District Judge need only make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the United States Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation to which specific objection is timely made.

*See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Failure to file, by the date stated above, a specific written objection to a proposed factual finding or legal conclusion will bar a party, except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice, from attacking on appeal any such proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the United States District Judge. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

**ORDER**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636, it is hereby **ORDERED** that each party is granted until **September 5, 2023**, to serve and file written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. It is further **ORDERED** that if objections are filed and the opposing party chooses to file a response, the response shall be filed within seven (7) days of the filing date of the objections.

SIGNED August 22, 2023.

  
JEFFREY L. CURETON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

## EXHIBIT A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION

LABOR SAVING SYSTEMS LTD.	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 4:21-cv-01389
v.	§	
	§	
DOES 1–79,	§	
Defendants.	§	

### ORDER GRANTING DEFAULT JUDGMENT

The Court considered on this day the *Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment*, filed August 2, 2023, seeking default judgment against Doe 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, and 74 (“Doe Defendants”) for patent infringement. After considering the motion and the case docket, the Court FINDS that the motion should be and herein is GRANTED as follows.

The Court FINDS Doe Defendants infringed Patent No. 9,737,941, and did so willfully, warranting treble damages and attorney fees as an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

THEREFORE, the Court AWARDS to Plaintiff Labor Saving Systems Ltd. as follows:

Plaintiff is awarded \$840 from each Doe Defendant for economic damages;

Plaintiff is awarded \$3,277.97 from each Doe Defendant for attorney fees;

The above awards are against each Doe Defendant individually, and not jointly.

Additionally, the Court ORDERS the Clerk to release the funds held by the Registry of the Court in the amount of \$10,000 paid initially by Plaintiff, and currently in the Court’s registry.

SO ORDERED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2023.

\_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE PRESIDING